

**Why I Am Not An
Evolutionist**

By L. A. Wilcox

A THESIS

presented to the Seminar in Contemporary Religious Thought
at the University of Southern California
School of Religion

by

LLEWELLYN A. WILCOX

F O R E W O R D

What is before you is a stenographically reported address delivered first in the Glendale Sanitarium Chapel and subsequently to a number of other churches in California, embodying within it a thesis presented, as indicated by the title page, to the School of Religion at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Due credit must be and is gratefully given to Professor George McCready Price, to A. L. Baker and F. D. Nichol, from whose book "Creation, not Evolution," many quotations are taken, and to several other writers in "The Signs of the Times," whose thoughts have been provocative. If, in the hasty collation of this material I have been guilty of unconscious plagiarisms, I must beg forgiveness. This was never prepared with the thought of publication in mind, and what value it possesses is rather in its succinctness and arrangement than in its originality.

Further copies may be secured from the author at 1509 East Wilson, Glendale, California.

INTRODUCTION

The theme I present is not of my own choosing, but is given in answer to many requests.

I begin with the text with which the speaker of last Sabbath began, found in Luke 18:8, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh shall He find faith in the earth?" The inference is clearly that there will be so **little** of it as to be practically **none** of it. May I this morning paraphrase that question: When the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith **in a modern university?** The first answer, given instinctively and logically, would be, "No, of all places, not there!" But when, five months ago I found it necessary to attend the university to meet certain scholastic qualifications now required of our Bible teachers, I determined that the answer, so far as one individual was concerned, should be "Yes!" And I determined that I would take for my motto while I refused (perhaps alone among 8,000 others) to bow my knee to Baal, the words of the second text of last Sabbath, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. I am not ashamed of it intellectually, philosophically, logically, pragmatically, experimentally, for it **is** the power of God—the revolutionizing, transforming, dynamic power of God in the life of every man who will give it a chance.

I didn't want to go to the University. I don't suppose Joseph wanted to go to Egypt either, or Daniel to Babylon. They must have felt lonely and alien there, and homesick there for the fellowship of their people, even as I. But God is going to give men His truth even if He has to send other men into captivity to give it to them. Many a time when disheartened at the empty husks of unreality offered as hypothesis, I have had to force myself to carry on with the thought that this may be perhaps why I'm here—that I can give these men, my teachers, more spiritual truth than they can give me.

It is surely no conceit to say that. I believe it is unsafe for any man to go to the university unless he goes there to witness for his God as well as to get a degree.

Coming, as one born, so to speak, an Adventist, brought up in an Adventist home, attending always Adventist schools, most of my work having been amidst Adventist surroundings, I found myself suddenly projected into a different world where they spoke in altogether different terms and had an altogether different way of thinking. A great deal of the time in some of my classes, I don't know what teacher and students are talking about. (I've been comforted to think, however, that they don't know either.)

I am taking—not by choice—a seminar class in Contemporary Religious Thought. The students are ministers and church workers,—the teacher a very prominent modernist. I felt that in a class like that my only safe policy was to let him know personally at the earliest opportunity who and what I was and where I stood. I remember my reactions from the first class session where it seemed as if everything I had believed was being torn to pieces, and I sat there in actual mental agony, but silent—for I felt that it was not yet the time to speak. After the period I sought him out and said, "Doctor, I think I ought to tell you the worst. I am a Seventh-day Adventist, and a fundamentalist, both by training and conviction." He said nothing for a moment, then looking directly at me he replied, "Mr. Wilcox, I'm a liberal, but I try to be liberal in spirit as well as theology. I'm intolerant of just one thing—and that's insincerity. Your frankness has scored a point with me. You and I may not see things alike, but I hope you'll think of me as a Christian brother." When he greets me on the campus, he is likely to say, "Well, you old heretic, how are you this morning?" I'm writing my Master's thesis on "The Place of the Seventh-day Adventist in American Christianity," and I have him on my thesis committee. I must pay my tribute to the fairness and liberal

spirit of some of these teachers of mine at the University and of their kindly attitude toward Seventh-day Adventists. I tell you I would rather deal any time with a liberal-spirited modernist than with a prejudiced and bigoted fundamentalist.

It is one thing to read about modernism and its atheistic trends and insidious influences upon the thought and life of students—it is another to come into actual first-hand contact and conflict with it. Part of the assignment in this aforementioned class is to attend the lectures each Monday afternoon in the University Religious Forum, held in **Mudd** Memorial Hall. (I emphasized the **Mudd** because of its appropriateness in describing the clearness of some of the lectures there given.) Sitting there I thought of the old song that goes something like this: "Do you know where they crucified my Lord?" and I thought it was there as verily as on Calvary. I thought of Mary's lament, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him," and I wondered if many of the students there might not have gone out from those lectures feeling just as spiritually desolate. The rest of the time we used a text-book whose chapters were the theological biographies of leading liberals today. As this is a seminar class, we had no final examinations, and in lieu of the final, the professor asked us to bring in a written or an oral summary of the semester's work.

How could I do it? "What is the chaff to the wheat?" Before we broke up, I said, "Doctor, by this time you folks all know me and something of what I believe. May I bring in a minority report?" He hesitated and finally said (when the class members began to clamor, "Sure, let him do it. It'll be interesting") "Yes, Mr. Wilcox, we want you to be intellectually honest. We'll be awaiting it."

I bring to you this morning the report I presented the next Monday to that class, taking up the full period. Before that group, I felt like Martin Luther before the Diet, saying, "God help me!" And he did help me.

PAUL'S INDICTMENT OF THE EVOLUTIONARY HYPOTHESIS

"Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.

"For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

"And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. . . .

"Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. . . .

"Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge. . . ."—Romans 1:19-23, 25, 28.

NOTE—This Scripture lesson was not, of course, a part of the thesis. It is included with the reminder to the reader that theories of evolution were held in the Greece and Egypt of Paul's day not so fundamentally dissimilar to those of today. It is included to reveal the Apostle's diagnosis of the reason for and the moral outcome of a doctrine which would banish God from His own world, and place on man the image of the bestial rather than of the divine.

WHY I AM NOT AN EVOLUTIONIST

**A Minority Report, submitted by L. A. Wilcox,
in Contemporary Religious Thought**

I should be glad, were there time, to present the full confession of my faith as a Seventh-day Adventist. Within the limits of what is left, that is manifestly impossible. I should like to give a reason for the hope that is within me, as the New Testament enjoins upon every Christian to be ready always to do. Representing the religious convictions of 300,000 people, that might rightfully be considered a part of contemporaneous religious thought.

After reading the biographical Credos which form the chapters of our text, and listening to the philosophical discussions of the university religious forum, the obscure writer of this humble apologia might seem presumptuous in this scholastic *Areopagus* to utter his differing belief. The genius of Protestantism and of religious liberty is, however, the right to differ. It is easier, he admits, to yield to prevailing modes, whether of thinking or of conduct; but he claims the protection in a Methodist institution of one who stands in defense of the faith of John Wesley!

In the present conflict in the arena of thought, no less tremendous than that of the sixteenth century, there is little disagreement as to the point at issue. Is it platitudinous, however, to point out that it is not a conflict between **true** science and **true** religion? For truth, though sometimes paradoxical, is never contradictory; and therefore where it seems to be, it is evident that something must be wrong with either the science or the religion, or both.

It does not seem difficult to determine that the base of the line of cleavage between the historical evangelical faith and modernism lies the evolutionary concept. Over against the fiat

creation of the world by a personal and transcendent God is the philosophical denial of supernaturalism in the origin of our earth and life upon it. Out of this grow all other differences. "If the Genesis story is unreliable, then the Bible is no longer a revelation from God, inerrant and authoritative. If a record of a divine creation in six literal days, as given in Genesis 1 and 2, is a myth, then the record of the sin and the fall of man in Genesis 3 is a myth; and if the sin and fall of man is untrue, the necessity for an atoning Saviour is done away with; and if there never was a first Advent in the sense of God coming down and becoming incarnate by a virgin birth, living a sinless life, and dying a vicarious death in the stead of sinning man, then of course the idea of His second advent is ridiculous; and if Christ is not expected to come again the second time with judgments and awards, why worry about moral responsibility?" Out of this question of naturalism or supernaturalism, evolution or creation, arise all other differences.

When one says therefore that he is an evolutionist, he is thereby declaring his type of religion. That the evolutionary theory "affects profoundly the foundations of philosophy, and therefore the whole domain of thought; . . . it determines the whole attitude of the mind toward nature and God,"¹ as declared by Joseph Le Conte, one of its foremost apologists, is a view which will be conceded by fundamentalists. Liberals also will quite agree with Dr. Herman Bavinck, Dutch theologian and university professor:

"To all questions concerning the origin and the essence of things, of heaven and of earth, of minerals and of plants, of animals and of men, of the state and of society, of religion and ethics, the same answer is invariably given; evolution is the key to the origin and existence of all things."²

¹ Joseph Le Conte, *Evolution and Its Relations to Religious Thought*, pp. C, D.

² Herman Bavinck, *The Philosophy of Revelation*, p. 42.

"The world-wide view, which formerly offered itself under the name of 'the scientific,' has not essentially changed, but has simply, owing to various influences, assumed now a religious form, and taken up its position as a new faith over against the old faith. The difference consists merely in the doctrine of evolution no longer contenting itself with standing as 'science' by the side of or over against Christianity, but pressing on determinedly to usurp the place of Christianity as dogma and religion."¹

When I say therefore that I am not an evolutionist, I announce thereby that I am a fundamentalist—and doubtless advertise myself to certain groups as an example of arrested development. But when I announce myself a creationist, let it be understood that I am one, not because I was brought up that way; but because in my conviction evolution is **unscientific**, because it is not only **un-Christian** but **immoral** in its effects, and because the creation story appeals to me as far more reasonable and therefore more probable. To my discussion I shall add in conclusion what I conceive to be the weakness and inconsistency of the so-called fundamentalist position.

I. Evolution is **not** an established fact of science. Strange how when scientists admit its unexplained gaps, and its chief apostles acknowledge it as a theory which must be held by "faith," so many apparently speak of it and treat it as if it were as confirmed as the law of gravitation! There are five things which must be proved before the theory of natural evolution can be demonstrated: (1) that matter can be made from nothing; (2) that energy can be increased in amount; (3) the possibility of spontaneous generation; (4) that acquired characteristics can be transmuted; (5) that distinctly new species (not mere analytic varieties or unit character) have been and are being produced according to Mendel's law.

¹ Herman Bavinck, *The Philosophy of Revelation*, p. 16.

1. As to the first, "the science of radioactivity shows that some of the heavier elements are disintegrating by loss of electrons into those of lighter weight, but no instance of the reverse process is known to science. Our modern scientific view of the world of matter makes it resemble a great clock constantly running down, with no known method of winding it up." This being true, how did anything come to be in the first place? Trace it all, if you please, a trillion years, and how much nearer are you to a solution? You can't have anything without a beginning, and you can't have a beginning without a beginner. If you have the hen, you can get the egg, and if you have the egg, you can get the hen, but if you have neither, how can you get either? Only a miracle can supply it: "**In the beginning God.**"¹

2. As for the second, "all our energy comes to us from the sun, and its numerous forms are freely transmitted to us here on earth and back and forth in a thousand ways, with constant slight losses, but absolutely without the gain of a single erg or a single calorie. To confirm this view we have the witness of astronomy that the amount of energy received from the sun has not varied from century to century, and we have never been able to increase it in the slightest degree by all of our mechanics or all our science." And again we are driven to the Bible explanation that "the works (of which energy is one) were finished (or fixed) from the foundation of the world."²

3. As for the third, there is **not one single instance of spontaneous generation.** Says Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, of the American Museum of Natural History: "The mode of the origin of life is a matter of pure speculation, in which we have as yet little observation or uniformitarian reasoning to

¹ Genesis 1:1.

² Genesis 3:4.

guide us."¹ And this quotation is characteristic of the admission of scientists, omitted for lack of time and space.

Since it is an established scientific fact that life can come only from life, the beginning of life demands an eternally living God as the source of life. And so, again, like the dove upon the waters who found no rest for the sole of her foot, we come back from the shifting floods of hypothesis to the ark of Genesis.

4. There is no scientific principle better established in modern biology than that acquired characteristics are not transmitted. Herbert Spencer said many years ago, "Either there has been inheritance of acquired characters, or there has been no evolution."² If he were alive today, would he accept the alternative now so well established?

5. In all human history have we any record that new species have been produced by either artificial or natural means? Listen to Dr. Bateson of the British Association for the Advancement of Science:

"Although we must hold to our faith in the evolution of species, there is little evidence as to how it has come about, and no clear proof that the process is continuing in any considerable degree at the present time. The thought uppermost in our minds is that knowledge of the nature of life is altogether too slender to warrant speculation on these fundamental subjects. Did we presume to offer such speculations, they would have no more value than those which alchemists might have made as to the nature of the elements."³

"Variations of many kinds, often considerable, we daily witness, but no origin of species."⁴

¹ Quoted by George McCready Price in *Why I am Not an Evolutionist*.

² *Ibid.*

³ Dr. Wm. Bateson, in *Science*, Sept. 4, 1914.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 20, 1922.

Commenting on the fact that one species has never been known to change into another, Dr. Thomas Hunt Morgan, of Columbia University, says: "It may be claimed that the theory of descent (evolution) is lacking, therefore, in the most essential feature that it needs to place the theory on a scientific basis. This must be admitted."¹ Because this is so, Dr. H. H. Newman, of the University of Chicago, confesses: "Reluctant as he may be to admit it, honesty compels the evolutionist to admit that there is no absolute proof of organic evolution."²

Over against this, we find seven times repeated in the Bible record, the scientific fixed principle, "after his kind." "And it was so," is the inspired refrain. And it is so, echoes every experimenter down to the atheist Luther Burbank, whose garden refused to testify against Genesis or repeal the natural law of the Creator.

6. I am not an evolutionist, because from evolutionists themselves, as well as from the factual evidence, I am not persuaded that the fossils prove evolution. "Geology," says Prof. Thomas Hunt Morgan, "is by all odds the strongest evidence that we have in favor of organic evolution."³ But the finding of immense areas in various parts of the world where the fossils occur in relative positions directly contrary to the installment plan of uniformitarianism, has opened our eyes to the fact that this supposed history of the successive types of life is only a huge blunder.

At this juncture it may not be uninteresting to note that the New Testament records a prophetic description of this same theory of uniformitarianism, or continuity of change, in these words:

¹ Dr. Thomas Hunt Morgan, "*Evolution and Adaptation*," p. 43.

² Dr. H. H. Newman, "*Readings in Evolution*," p. 57.

³ Prof. T. H. Morgan, "*A Critique of the Theory of Evolution*," p. 24.

"Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." ¹

This reference is not complimentary, but runs so true to fact that it at once becomes patent that the theory which is anti-biblical in its very essence, becomes thus a fulfillment of the truth of Biblical prediction.

So much reliance has been placed upon the fossils that it is well to know from evolutionists themselves with what unreliability the evidence is really beset. From Prof. L. T. More, of the University of Cincinnati, I quote:

"Evolutionists would have us believe that they have photographed the succession of fauna and flora, and have arranged them on a vast moving picture film. Its slow unrolling takes millions of years. A few pictures mostly vague, defaced, and tattered, occasionally attract our attention. Between these memorials of the past are enormous lengths of films containing no pictures at all. And we cannot tell whether these parts are blanks or whether the impression has faded from sight. Is the scenario a continuous show or is it a succession of static events? The evidence from paleontology (fossils) is for discontinuity; only by faith and imagination is there continuity of variation." ²

And I might quote many others.

7. I am not an evolutionist, because evolution has failed to supply the missing link between man and the lower animals. Out of many statements two admissions are here presented. Says Dr. Walter Hough, head curator of the Department of Anthropology of the United States National Museum:

¹ 2 Peter 3:3, 4.

² Prof. L. T. More, "*The Dogma of Evolution*," pp. 160, 161.

"There are, unfortunately for our theory, too many missing links. We are confident we are right, but to marshall enough facts—known specimens linking man with the dim past—is another matter. . . . The chain of evidence connecting man with his ancient predecessors is sadly broken. Even the Neanderthal and Heidelberg 'men' do not help to mend this chain."¹

And says Dr. Clark Wissler, curator-in-chief of the Anthropological Section of the American Museum of Natural History:

"As far as science has discovered, there always was a man—some not so developed, but still human beings in all their functions, much as we are today. . . . Man came out of a blue sky as far as we have been able to delve back."²

8. Neither does evolution account for the mystery of human language. Declared the great philologist, Max Müller:

"Human language such as we possess requires a faculty of which no trace has been discovered in lower animals. Rational language is traced back to roots, and every root is the sign of a general conception or abstract idea, of which the animal is incapable."³

9. It does not account for the religious emotions and aspirations of man.

"There are more than physical and mental gaps that separate man from the beasts; there is a great gulf fixed between them spiritually. Whence came the religious emotions and aspirations of man, those feelings after God, the deep-seated though perhaps ill-defined conviction that we are in some way accountable to a higher Being? The evolutionist's attempts to

¹ Dr. Walter Hough, *Encyclopedia Britannica*; XXX, p. 145, Ed. of 1922.

² Dr. Clark Wissler, Quoted by O'Toole in "The Case Against Evolution," p. 344.

³ Quoted by Dr. H. A. Johnston, "Scientific Christian Thinking," p. 73.

explain these spiritual phenomena in terms of evolution are pitiable indeed. He will tell you, if he is a logical out-and-out evolutionist, that in the long ago the instinct to look to the leader of the pack or clan became more refined and abstract, and gradually was directed upward toward the more elevated conception of a great Leader above. Some evolutionists may take exception to such a bald statement of their view; but stripped of pleasing rhetoric, that must be the explanation.

"There are two questions that we immediately raise. The first is this: Does not such an explanation make God simply a shadow of our own mind's throwing—an illustration of the wish being father to the thought? There is no way of escaping this conclusion. But such a conclusion leaves us speechless before the Bolshevik, who, pushing the logic of the case to its limit, charges that religion is an opiate for the people, because it keeps them from full freedom through fear of offending a god who is but the product of their own minds. To the large majority of evolutionists, who are frantically endeavoring to harmonize their theory with good religion, this problem of the origin of man's religious nature presents a real difficulty.

"So much for the first question. Our second is this: If a high moral sense and an exalted spiritual nature are products of a long-drawn-out evolutionary process, how do you explain the fact that degraded idol-worshipping cannibals can be changed almost overnight into quiet Christian men? Here is a change so sweeping that it staggers the imagination, and defies the mechanical lock-step conception of 'orderly change' of which the evolutionist prates so loudly." ¹

10. Why should I be an evolutionist when the confession of evolution's leading apostles places its acceptance upon faith rather than upon evidence?

Examples: Dr. L. T. More, in "The Dogma of Evolution," page 160; Huxley, "Discourses Biographical and Geological"; Dr. William E. Ritter, in *Science*, April 4, 1922; et al.

¹ A. L. Baker and F. D. Nichol, *Creation, Not Evolution*, pp. 72, 73.

I agree with the noted French evolutionist and Sorbonne professor, Yves Delage, who says:

"I am, however, absolutely convinced that a man supports or does not support transformism (the French term for evolution), not for reasons taken from natural history, but because of his philosophic views."¹

II. Furthermore I cannot believe a doctrine to be true which has the inevitable moral aspects and results which evolution has.

1. "Any religion or philosophy must measure up to the needs of man, or it is valueless. If it does not have a remaking power, wherein the propensities of the human heart which are anti-social and unrighteous can be changed into or exchanged for just and pure and righteous attributes, then that system is only a mockery. It must give a society a workable code of morals, or of what use is it? Likewise, any world-view, be it called a religion or what not, which bids for our acceptance, must hold out something regarding the future which will satisfy the hopes of men. Lastly, it must give us a God who is nigh to every one of us and a present help in time of trouble; a God whom we can worship and serve; a God who loves us and whom we can love. Evolution does not do that."²

2. Evolution minimizes sin, for according to it sin is only inherited animalism. It is not man's fault, but his misfortune that he is a sinner. Man is therefore not accountable for his acts, and is therefore not a free moral agent. With our brute inheritance, unaccountable to a personal Creator, why should we not behave like animals? Why, then, any moral code?

¹ Yves Delage, "La Structure du Protoplasma et les Theories sur l'Heredite," p. 184.

² A. L. Baker and F. D. Nichol, "Creation not Evolution," p. 103, 104.

3. I am personally at a loss to understand how a man can be both an evolutionist and a Christian. Certainly he who believes in evolution differs from Jesus Christ, who declared "Male and female created He them."¹ Furthermore, evolution, in denying His supernatural birth, would make Him not merely a bastard, but **the son of an ape.**

4. Furthermore I cannot be a theistic evolutionist, for this school makes God the author of evil. Witness Le Conte, its chief defender:

"If evolution be true, and especially if man be indeed a product of evolution, then what we call evil is not a unique phenomenon confined to man, and the result of an accident, but must be a great fact pervading all nature, and a part of its very constitution. It must have existed in all time in different forms, and subject like all else to the law of evolution."²

III. I am not an evolutionist because it is certainly wisdom to hold to the things which are not disproved until their opposites are proved. I am not yet satisfied that the record of creation as given in Genesis 1 and 2 is unscientific.

1. Evolution says it seems unreasonable to think of God bringing the world into existence instantly. That depends upon one's conception of God. If man can produce an ocean liner in a year, why take a thousand to whittle it out with a pocket knife? If God is omnipotent,—and if He is not, He is not worthy to be my God,—why should He take six million years to make the world when He could do it in six days?

When mere man can begin to speak of "the application of terrific energy in such a way as to effect changes in an instant," we should not find our faith unduly taxed in accepting the Biblical story. Man believes he will do these feats

¹ Mark 10:6.

² Joseph Le Conte, "*Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought*," p. 365.

instantaneously by harnessing the lightning. Why should we not have faith, then, to believe that God, out of whose "throne proceeded lightnings,"¹ could likewise accomplish His creative acts instantaneously? To the evolutionists who mix Milton with Moses, and who seem unable to conceive of God as possessing any greater power than themselves, the rebuke of Christ applies: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."²

2. The record informs us that "out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air." "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground."³ "Certainly no one wishes to take exception to these statements, for the science of chemistry informs us that all the elements composing the bodies of men and beasts are to be found in the earth. Still, in passing, we may marvel over the fact that Moses, living many centuries before the development of chemical analysis, should have felt free to speak so dogmatically as to the nature of our bodies; for to the ignorant mind, flesh and blood seem essentially different from the dust of the ground." Who told Moses that?

3. May I point out that in three verses of Genesis 1, Moses gives us the explanation for the origin of life: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; the explanation of the law governing the continuity of the race in that decree which established reproduction within certain species: "after his kind"; the explanation of man a spiritual being as apart from animals: "And God made man in His own image." In a hundred years and a thousand volumes have the "explanations" of Darwin, Huxley, and their successors, who vary by any number of million years, told us as much?

¹ Revelation 4:5.

² Matthew 22:29.

³ Genesis 2:19, 7.

4. A vigorous writer, Dr. A. C. Dixon, comes forward with another staggering conundrum. As he tells us, "Embryonic, immature life is never reproductive." Even if God in the beginning had created embryonic, immature life, it could never have reproduced itself. "Eggs never hatch eggs; apples never bear apples; it takes a hen to hatch eggs. It takes a tree to bear apples. Babies never bear babies." All this being true, we must ask, in the name of science and of common sense, how evolution could ever have brought into being mature life that was capable of reproduction?

5. Genesis 1:26, 27; 2:19, 20 gives us the explanation which evolutionists are at a loss to give, of the origin of language and the religious aspirations of men. If "we find nowhere a trace of a primitive language," "then the only reasonable deduction is that a fully developed language was man's possession from the very first."

6. And may I close this section with a question: How account for the week if the Biblical story of creation is a myth? The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says:

"The week is a period of seven days, having no reference whatever to the celestial motions,—a circumstance to which it owes its unalterable uniformity. Although it did not enter into the calendar of the Greeks, and it was introduced at Rome until after the reign of Theodosius, it has been employed from time immemorial in almost all eastern countries; and as it forms neither an aliquot part of the year nor of the lunar month, those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at a loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign it to an origin having such semblance of probability."¹

IV. In declaring myself a fundamentalist, I am determined to be a consistent one. I am of the opinion that fundamentalists have weakened their cause in surrendering the

¹ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Article, "Calendar," IV. p. 988.

literality of the days of creation. As soon as they do this, they give away their whole case.

I am a Seventh-day Adventist. I observe the seventh day. I believe that if the church of God through the ages had faithfully and understandingly observed the Sabbath, there would be today no evolution within the pale of the church. Were I not a Sabbatarian, I should be an evolutionist.

For the seventh-day Sabbath is the divine memorial of a literal creation of this world by God in six days.

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."¹

That fact is enshrined in the heart of the Decalogue:

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day, wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."²

It can readily be seen, therefore, how the seventh-day Sabbath, as a God-given memorial of the Genesis creation, absolutely nullifies the evolutionary theory. And for this reason among others was the Sabbath given, not to the Jew only, but to all mankind for every age and dispensation, but especially for our own generation when the fact and truth of His creatorship is denied.

¹ Genesis 2:1-3.

² Exodus 20:8-11.

Arthur Brisbane, writing in his "To-day" column said some years ago: "There is more than enough cut out of the old commandments to make room for the two new ones, and the cutting seems to have been done along the lines of modern criticism. They have taken out 'in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh day and hallowed it.' That's a change in favor of modern theories on geology and evolution."

Our fundamentalist friends in repudiating the Sabbath are rejecting the great bulwark of historic Christianity against the tide of liberalism. In rejecting the Sabbath—the constantly recurring memorial of the creative power of God, they are dulling the edge of their swords in the conflict with evolution. When the Sabbath stands, the story of creation must stand; when the story of creation stands, as recorded in Genesis 1 and 2, then the fall of man must also stand, as recorded in Genesis 3; if man sinned, then the necessity and fact of the Saviourhood of Christ must stand; and if His first coming stands, then the truth and hope of His second coming stands. In the Sabbath I see the divine answer to evolution. In the Sabbath I find the groundwork of the plan of redemption and the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

If for reasons I have given, I cannot honestly be an evolutionist, I find myself forced to take my stand by the eternal monument of the Creator to His sovereign power.

C O N C L U S I O N

You are interested, of course, in the reaction. I had the most rapt attention, with all the class taking notes, including the teacher, and interruptions only to repeat some statement. The very boldness of the thing I was doing seemed to create an atmosphere of interest; at least when I had concluded, the professor said,—please pardon me for repeating it—I consider it not a compliment to me, but to the truth—the professor said, “I want to say before this class that I consider Mr. Wilcox has presented one of the most masterly arguments on this question I have ever heard, and I must admit that many of his arguments are unanswerable.”

But I was more impressed later with what he said to me personally, “Mr. Wilcox, it’s true that we liberals are out in the open, exposed and without protection from the attacks of atheism, while you folks are behind the bulwarks.” And there was wistfulness in his voice when he said it.

A number of the students who are pastors of churches in and near Los Angeles who had before been rather critical in their attitude toward us as a people, came to beg for a copy of the paper. I know they would never read any of our printed literature, but I hope and pray through the deep impressions of that day the truth as it is in Jesus, may do in them and through them the work of God.

And now I close this talk today with the text with which I closed my benediction of last Sabbath, the word of the Lord in 2 Timothy 2:19, “Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, that the Lord knoweth them that are His.” I thank God for that text.

Years ago San Francisco lay in ruins through an earthquake far worse than that which wrecked Long Beach. All

its proud glory levelled to the dust, all its magnificence a smoking desolation. You might have gone down in those days, they tell me, to what had been the Civic Center. There on one side the City Hall was gone; upon another, the City Library demolished; upon another the Museum wrecked and shattered—but upon the other, what was that? Standing—still standing above the devastation all about it, one wall of the building of the American Bible Society. And look, what are those words that stand out so prominently, arresting the attention and gripping the imagination amidst that scene of wide-spread ruin? Oh, significant, unforgettable words, there as if preserved by an angel hand to witness for God out of that hour, “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of our God shall stand forever.”

My friends, after all the pagan philosophies have crumbled into dust, after all the evolutionary hypotheses have gone down—or gone up—in smoke, after all the world’s wisdom that knows not God lies shattered and still,—“the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, **because the breath of man bloweth upon it, but the WORD OF OUR GOD SHALL STAND FOREVER!**”

Upon it today let us take our stand, even if for God we stand alone! God helping us, we can do no other!

NOTE—The concluding pages offer a few additional arguments concerning the fallibility, uncertainty, and absurdity of this theory which assumes (except among real scientists) a dogmatism unsurpassed by any theology.

A PRAYER FOR FORGIVENESS

*The fool hath said—The fool hath said—
And we, who deemed him wise,
We who believed that Thou wast dead—
How should we seek Thine eyes?*

*How should we seek to Thee for power
Who scorned thee yesterday?
How should we kneel in this dread hour?
Lord, teach us how to pray!*

*Grant us the single heart once more
That mocks no sacred thing.—
The sword of truth our fathers wore
When Thou wast Lord and King.*

*The towering Babels that we raised
Where scoffing sophists brawl—
The little antichrists we praised—
The night is on them all!*

*Let darkness unto darkness tell
Our deep unspoken prayer;
For while our souls in darkness dwell,
We know that Thou art there!*

—Alfred Noyes.

FURTHER WHY NOT

The philosophy which in the name of "science," and with the pompous assertion "Modern Scholarship is agreed," demands my intellectual allegiance—the philosophy which comes as a substitute for the creationism of the Bible, asserting that surely I am not so foolish as to believe that any more—ought to present as credentials to my reason a more reasonable, understandable, and factual explanation of the origin of the world and life upon it than that which it says I must discard. **Does it do it?**

To do it, it must account for the origin of matter, force, life, and the species. By the admissions of its champions and defenders from Darwin and Spencer even until now, and by the total absence of any known facts, evolution has nothing to offer by way of accounting for these. Why then accept evolution until it can account for them?

Because, proclaimed in the name of scholarship, it is generally accepted? How many of the great mass who seem to assent to it, having grown up under its dogmatism, have ever put it to the crucial test for **proof**? Ever dared to doubt it? Is popular or general belief the **ultimate test of truth**? Millennia ago Isaiah declared that the earth was round,¹ but through the centuries of the Dark Ages, practically every "scientist" as well as everyone else believed that it was flat. For centuries, although Bible writers had affirmed otherwise,² the world, including the scientists, believed that the stars could be counted, and that the air had no weight. It was generally believed once that the sun moved around the earth instead of the earth around the sun. Only Galileo dared to believe otherwise. **The majority is not necessarily right.**

¹ Isaiah 40:22.

² Genesis 15:5; Hebrews 11:12; Job 28:25.

Furthermore, which theory of evolution shall I subscribe to? To that which begins the universe with intense heat getting colder or that which begins it with the fearful cold getting warmer? To that of Tate which places the earth's age at ten million years or that of Ramsay which places it at several trillion—after all what are a few thousand million years among evolutionists? Are they not "liberals?"

The name of evolutionary theories are legion and how they conflict with and expose one another! Is it not written somewhere that "a house divided against itself shall not stand?"

The Mississippi delta was estimated by Lyell to have been 100,000 years in the formation, but the United States survey estimated it at 4,000 years, and M. Beaument at 1300. The peat beds of Albeville, France, where human remains were found, once estimated at 20,000 years, are now calculated to be one fifth of that age. A skeleton unearthed at New Orleans was estimated at 57,000 years in age, until a part of the skeleton's flatboat was discovered in the same stratum, and the antiquity of the remains was reduced to 50 years.

Alexander Patterson cites Lord Kelvin as saying that "only a few million years are possible for the earth on any calculation, and that these would all be needed for the change from ape to man, to say nothing of the interminable ages necessary for the change from protozoa to the fish, and then to land animals, and so on to mammals, and up to the ape."¹

The uncertainty of evolution is a strange credential for its acceptance as "science." Its pathfinder Darwin was so uncertain that over 800 times in his two principal works he uses the phrase "we may well suppose" and with disconcerting frequency the words "apparently" and "probably." After locating our ancestors in jungle tree tops, Darwin, concluded that "it is useless to speculate upon the subject." Verily,

¹ Alex Patterson, *The Other Side of Evolution*, p. 90, 91, 76.

ever since, evolutionists, though they reject Darwin, have followed along in the same trail of uncertainty; so much so, that Dr. Vernon Kellogg says:

"Oddly enough, the anti-evolutionists have taken little advantage of this uncertainty among the evolutionists concerning the causal explanation. . . . They could have made more trouble if they had stressed more the differences of opinion among the evolutionists concerning the causes and control of evolution." ¹

"The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken, lo, they have reected the word of the Lord, and what wisdom is in them? Jer. 8:9.

That rather apt comment of Scripture leads me to another point. Over against the Genesis explanation of how man got here, consider this answer to "where did you come from, baby dear?" Where did you get your eyes so blue? Some primeval ancestor found one day on the side of the head which was turned to the sun, a little freckle or pigment spot. It so agreeable affected him that he acquired the habit of turning it to the sun. The triumph of achievement represented by that habit, he transmitted to his posterity. The freckle acquired sensitiveness by use, developed into a nerve, which in several millions of years became your eye so blue, baby dear. But there was only one eye. How extraordinarily fortunate that the second one came out opposite instead of on the end of the nose or the back of the neck!

How did you get your legs, baby dear? Why, one of the primordial organisms found on its body some little warts which helped its progress as it wiggled along, so it developed the habit of usng them; and so these warts lengthened and strengthened by use became at last rudimentary limbs which in hundreds of centures produced your legs, baby dear. How lucky those legs developed in the right place instead of several

¹ Vernon Kellogg, *Evolution, the Way of Man*, pp. 94, 95.

on the same side! Take care of your warts! No telling what they will become some day!

And how did you get your backbone? "Originally the backbone was unsegmented, but in bending its body from side to side in locomotion through the water, its spinal column became divided by the action of simple mechanical force."¹

"Alice in Wonderland?" "Arabian Nights?" No, merely Evolution telling us how we came."

Must we accept this as SCIENCE? In all candor and common sense, does it take half the faith to believe Genesis 1 that it takes to swallow this?

"Let us pause here," says Patterson, "to contemplate the spectacle of a theory which its own advocates admit is unproven, and which has been opposed by some of the greatest minds, a theory which has not a single fact of evidence and has o way of accounting for the changes which it declares have taken place; such a theory accepted as the basis of every science, the foundation of a universal philosophy, taught in educational institutions to youth as if demonstrated, demanded immediate and universal submission, undertaking to revise Scripture, to revolutionize theology and to prescribe what we must do to be saved and to save others!"²

And yet so-called liberals talk of the "dogmatism" of historic Christianity!

I have been reading again the first chapter of Genesis. Since evolution fails to afford a solution of the origin of matter, force, life, and species, what recourse have I but to accept the inevitable alternate—"In the beginning God"? "And if there was a Creator at the origin of life, why not at the origin of all living things? It is simply a question of degree."

"If the Creator be admitted at any point," says Haeckel, evolution's great German protagonist, He may as well be admitted all along."

¹ Prof. H. W. Conn, *Evolution of Today*, p. 65.

² Alex Patterson, *The Other Side of Evolution*, p. 35.

Daring enough to put upon evolution the burden of proof, impertinent enough to demand facts instead of theories, we close. Through faith I can "understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of (an omnipotent) God." (Heb. 11:3). Through speculation what can I understand?

I can understand this: a word from Herbert Spencer at the age of 83: "The 'intellectual man' who occupies the same tenement with me, tells me that I am but a piece of animated clay, equipped with a nerve system and in some mysterious way connected with the big dynamo called the world; but that very soon now the circuit will be cut and I will fall, fall into unconsciousness and nothingness. Yes, I am sad, unutterably sad, and I wish in my heart I had never heard of the 'intellectual man' with his science, philosophy, and logic." (Facts and Comments). ¹

This is the hope that evolution offers.

"If you have a divine origin, you may have hope for a divine destiny. But if you choose a beginning devoid of God, you may look for an end forsaken of God."

Against the despairing negation of the dying Spencer as to what intellectual **doubt** had done for him, let me record in fairness the affirmation of the dying Paul in witness to what intellectual **faith** had done for him: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day." (2 Tim. 1:12).

By their fruits shall ye know them!